



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,953	03/19/2004	Paul C. Blank	11453.00	8082

29994 7590 07/24/2006

DOUGLAS S. FOOTE
NCR CORPORATION
1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD. WHQ5E
WHO-5E
DAYTON, OH 45479

EXAMINER

NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,953

Applicant(s)

BLANK ET AL.

Examiner

Patricia L. Nordmeyer

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejections

1. The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 – 6, 9 – 11, 16, 19, 23, 27, 28 and 31 as anticipated by Lane in the office action dated April 19, 2006 is withdrawn due to Applicant's arguments and amendments in the paper dated May 22, 2006.
2. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1-8, 12 – 15 and 17 – 29 over Smith in view of Lane in the office action dated April 19, 2006 is withdrawn due to Applicant's arguments and amendments in the paper dated May 22, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slagsvol (USPN 4,884,826).

Slagsvol disclose a web (Figure 2, #1b) wound longitudinally in a roll (Figure 2, #8), said web including a train of longitudinally separated identical adhesive patches aligned along one lateral edge (Figure 6, #2f; Column 2, lines 45 – 48) to define corresponding labels each having a

Art Unit: 1772

minor adhesive patch isolated inboard in a surrounding adhesive-free remainder of each label (Figure 6, #2f), with said adhesive-free remainder transversely bridging said web longitudinally between said patches to permit adhesive-free cutting of said web to separate said labels (Column 2, lines 45 – 48, wherein the spaces in between the adhesive patches would allow for cutting of the sheet).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 – 9, 11 – 15, 17 – 25 and 27 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (USPN 5,578,352) in view of Slagsvol (USPN 4,884,826).

Smith discloses a label roll (Column 1, lines 40 – 43) comprising web (Column 2, lines 54 – 58) that is continuous along said running axis and imperforate (Column 3, lines 6 and 7) having a front surface and an opposite back surface wound longitudinally along a running axis (Figure 2, #13 and 14) in a roll (Column 1, lines 40 – 43), said back surface including a plurality of non continuous adhesive patches (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 1; Column 3, lines 42 – 46) aligned in a column along a running axis of said web in a minor area of said back surface with the remaining area of said back surface being devoid of adhesive (Figure 2, #34 and 35; Column 4, lines 16 – 18) and including adhesive-free spaces transversely bridging said web

Art Unit: 1772

longitudinally between said adhesive patches to isolate said patches in sequential labels and permit cutting of said web in said adhesive-free spaces to separate said labels (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 1; Column 3, lines 42 – 46, whereby the adhesive-free areas are formed in between the discontinuous strips) and said front surface including a release strip extending along said running axis behind said column of adhesive patches and laminated to said patches in successive layers in said roll (Column 3, lines 42 – 52) with said patches being sized for bonding an individual label to a surface (Figure 3, #11) in claims 1, 3 and 19. With regard to claims 4 – 7, 23 and 24, the patches are aligned along said edge of said web (Figure 2, #34 and 35), have straight edges aligned parallel and transversely with said running axis forming a rectangular shaped area (Figure 3) and are elongate along said running axis (Figure 2 and 3). The web further includes corresponding index marks between adjacent patches to define corresponding labels (Figure 3, #19) as in claims 8, 15, 21 and 25. With regard to claims 17, 18, 22 and 29, the release strip is narrow to conform in width with said column of adhesive patches thereby leaving the remainder of the web front side devoid (Column 3, lines 48 – 42) and is made from a silicone coating (Column 3, line 33). As in claim 28, each of said labels has a plurality of said adhesive patches (Figure 2, #34 and 35). However, Smith fails to disclose the patches being isolated on one side only of the transverse middle, being aligned on one lateral edge of the web and closer thereto than an opposite edge of said web, the patches have arcuate edges extending transversely with said running axis, convex leading edges with convex trailing edges connected by straight edges, ovals with major axes disposed parallel to the running axis, and the patches being elongate transverse to said running axis.

Art Unit: 1772

Slagsvol teach disclose the patches being isolated on one side only of the transverse middle (Figure 6, #2f; Column 2, lines 45 – 48), being aligned on one lateral edge of the web and closer thereto than an opposite edge of said web (Figure 6, #2f; Column 2, lines 45 – 48) for the purpose of forming a paper that is easily and rapidly applied to a surface (Column 1, lines 43 – 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided a single adhesive patch isolated on one side only of the transverse middle in Smith in order to form a paper that is easily and rapidly applied to a surface as taught by Slagsvol.

Regarding the patches having arcuate edges extending transversely with said running axis, convex leading edges with convex trailing edges connected by straight edges, ovals with major axes disposed parallel to the running axis, it is well settled that a particular shape of a prior invention carries no patentable weight unless the applicant can demonstrate that the new shape provides significant unforeseen improvements to the invention. See *In re Seid*, 161 F.2d 229, 73 USPQ 431 (CCPA 1947), *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). In the instant case, the application does not indicate any new, significant attributes of the invention due to its shape, which would have been unforeseen to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the shape of the adhesive patch as Smith teaches a variety of shapes being used (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 1; Column 3, lines 42 – 46).

Art Unit: 1772

7. Claims 10, 16 and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (USPN 5,578,352) in view of Slagsvol (USPN 4,884,826) as applied to claims 1 – 9, 11 – 15, 17 – 25 and 27 – 29 above, and further in view of Lane (USPN 2,170,147).

Smith, as modified with Slagsvol, discloses the claimed roll except for the web being devoid of index marks and the release strip covering said web front side in full.

Lane teaches the patches of adhesive (Figure 1, #11; Page 2, Column 1, lines 33 – 38), the release strip covering said web front in full (Page 2, Column 1, lines 44 – 51) and devoid of index marks (Figure 1) for the purpose of being able to cut each band from a coated sheet without gumming the cutting knife and with fusing together the edges of the resulting bands (Page 3, Column 1, lines 15 – 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided a single adhesive patch in an elongate shape in the modified Smith in order to cut each band from a coated sheet without gumming the cutting knife and with fusing together the edges of the resulting bands as taught by Lane since the modified Smith discloses the use of discontinuous strips (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 1; Column 3, lines 42 – 46).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 29 and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, since the same prior art is being applied in the above rejections, the arguments will be responded to below.

In response to Applicant's argument that Smith fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of discrete adhesive patches arranged in a column, please see the newly presented rejection above.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1772

pln